Route 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
2/6/73

Dear Mr. Etlin,

Whether it is clear to you or not, I think I do understand the problem you face in representing my nephew Clark Crolley and neither in the past nor now am I or was I trying to tell you how to do it. Your practical problem is what is best for him, not what is justice in the abstract or can or should the police and prosecutors be able to get away with anything. I do not pretend to be in a position to make the evaluations you make, and I know I am not. I have, in fact, discussed this with Clark, explained why I feel I can give him any advice other than to have confidence in you.

As I am sure you known, I was shocked at the police falsifications in this matter. In the case of Hutch, I was disappointed, for I felt that he was a good, professional policeman. With Michaleski disappointment hardly describes my feeling because I felt he was much more than a good professional. He came accross as one of the warmest, most human of men in a profession that by its nature dehumanizes. So, that both would lie as both have is something that was hard for me to understand.

I know of some of the corruption in Montgomery County, some of the cover-up police scandals, and of the statistical manner in which unsolved crimes are "solved". Only in part did it satisfy me to tell myself this was an easy case in which the statistics would build, perhaps assisting advancement.

There was one little incident in one of my conversations with Hutch that did not make sense. Because it did not it lingered in my mind. There may be an explanation in today's New York Times.

Hutch and I were talking about my work of recent years, an in-depth study of the functioning of government in time of political assassinations, mostly that of t he President. He told me ~~xxxxxxxx~~ that he had seen what is known as the Zapruder movie many times. This movie is the best of the JFK assassination. It was taken by an amatour, was bought by LIFE, and has been kept closely-guarded. The only place it can be seen, theoretically, is in the National Archive. And that, certainly, is not the haunt of the harried police!

My study of this film has been exhaustive. I know where the accounted-for official copies are, when and where they were made and from what, etc. When the film was being processed, three copies were made. The original and one copy went to LIFE and two copies were given to the Secret Service, of which Agent Max Phillips distatched one copy to Washington that night and one was retained for investigative use in Dallas. LIFE has sued to prevent use of its property, for it bought the film and all rights from Zapruder. The Archives does not make copies available.

The Secret Service let the FBI have a copy later. From this the FBI made other copies. However, the FBI was so tight with this film that it refused to let the CIA have a copy when the CIA asked for it. I brought this to light in my third book, where I printed J. Edgar Hoover's letter to the Warren Commission cunsel in facsimile, with a ridiculing note. I am aware of the supposed legal limitations placed upon the CIA. The sentence to which I attracted attention reads,"The Central Intelligence Agency has inquired if the film copy in possession of this Bureau can be loaned to that Agency solely for training purposes." My footnote includes these questions about the CIA's "training purposes": To train assassins? Or to teach them how not to get caught?". The Commission's annotation on this letter indicates that the film would be provided by LIFE.

From Hutch's description of the film he saw, as of great clarity and including full-frame color slides, he could only have seen a copy made from the original and slides made from the original, and these, I am satisfied, had to be at the CIA. Full-frame slides can be made only from the original, LIFE alone had that and specifically, neither the FBI nor the Warren Commission did. Clarity is also a significant clue, for any copy provided by [illegible] with an 8mm amatour film, this is not clear.

The FBI had to be at least fourth generation and with an 8mm

All of this and more I understood when Hutch let his little bit slip out. Yet I could not believe that the CIA had shown him the Zapruder film, and I assumed he had perhaps seen it at the FBI academy and was exaggerating a bit.

Developments in Congress yesterday and in today's Times state unequivocally that among 14 local police departments to which the CIA gave illegal training one is Montgomery County. Hutch is a Montgomery County detective. I assume he is one who got this CIA training that is quite specifically precluded by law. I am also aware of how the CIA bends the law. They have with regard to me. The do engage in domestic intelligence, I am among those who have interested it, and I do have copies of some of their surveillance on me. One of those conducting this surveillance described me as "that old nemisis of the CIA", which is quite wrong, if a bit flattering. So is the evaluation of another, that I hold the "all-time track record" for their interest in my field.

Please understand that I am neither anti-police nor anti-intelligence. I am against abuses and illegalities, and these I have exposed, including,as you can see from this one sample, those of the CIA. It is I who expose Oswald's connection with a CIA front. I have worked with local and federal police in the past, including the recent past and a number of jurisdictions. I would not have taken Clark to the police when I learned one had been to his home if I were anti-police, because the purpose of my taking him there was for him to tell them anything and everything he might know in which they might be interested with the sole stipulation that it not hurt him. Nor would I have been willing to take Michaloski's word, later Hutch's.

So we have a mystery to be compared with a certainty and a high probability. The mystery is why both of these detectives would lie when they know their lying can be proven in a court of law. I thought of more ways this could be proven after speaking to you about it. Aside from my being able to prove I was there with Clark and when from things that then and there transpired and will be shown by police records, I can think of four witnesses, including four who knew that Clark had been told there were no charges against him so he could talk safely. Yet they lie. The certainty is of CIA dislike of and improper interest in me. Here I have given you only a few examples, those where if you doubt my word I can lay unquestionable proof in your hand. There are others. The probability is of Hutch's CIA connection from this illegal training I am assuming he got. That also might be susceptible of proof.

This also could explain all the nasty little prejudicial improprieties that served no purpose other than prejudicing any judge who would see the record of them and making a contrived docket look bad. And, perhaps, the excessive police interest in him when there are so many more pressing matters to which it should attend. At the very worst he is a potty consideration, and you and I both know his problem is not criminality but emotional ones. But the amount of time and money devoted to him has to be great. It makes little sense. Compare it, if you will, with the Ziegler case, where they know they are dealing with a real pro, can put him away for a long time and solve many problems, past and future, and don't even go get him when they can.

In the context I am suggesting, I can also understand the seeming determination of the prosecutor and his seeming impoliteness in never returning my phone calls and not responding when I was in his office and left a message.

This is for your information, for whatever use you can make of it or for your ignoring it if that is your decision. I will not now tell either Clark of his mother, unless you think I should. I do not so think. I have never used the information I have given you and more because I've been waiting for what might seem to be a good time. I have merely deposited duplicates of the evidence outside my possession. Therfuture

will control that. My hunch is that the Congress would be quite interested, the New York Times, where I know people, might well be, and I think I'll start querying some publications, without reference to Clark's situation.

Should you care to discuss this with the prosecutor, and the judgement and decision are and have to be your decision, not mine, I would ask you to convey what I have told you of the evidence I have in generalities only. I do not want others to get hurt. It must be obvious that I could not have the evidence I have without someone on the inside getting disgusted. The copies I have are, in fact, original copies, and they are from an inside source. Clark's is a minor, very minor, illustration of what those with uncontrolable power do when they get turned on. My files abound with bad cases.

I would like to think that Montgomery County officialdom would not like to have it brought out that they sent police to the CIA for training in how to harrass kids and that they would want to bring it to an end so that this considerable police effort might be devoted to solving some of the more serious crimes. At the same time I am by no means suggesting that you make Clark into a cause celebre. I certainly, wouldn't think of making the effort pending the disposition of his case and would not think of attracting any attention to him if he does not go to jail. He has more than enough troubles without that. (I think he is making progress from his account of his conversations with you. He certainly is in contact with reality with regard to them.)

It is not necessary for you to take time to respond to this letter unless there is something you would like of me.

I enclose a copy of the Times story.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg